



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/552,484	10/06/2005	Chan Ho Kyung	2101-3085	2358

35884

7590

03/24/2009

LEE, HONG, DEGERMAN, KANG & WAIMEY

660 S. FIGUEROA STREET

Suite 2300

LOS ANGELES, CA 90017

EXAMINER

BALAOING, ARIEL A

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2617

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/24/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@lhlaw.com

ip.lhlaw@gmail.com

ip.lhlaw@live.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/552,484

Applicant(s)

KYUNG ET AL.

Examiner

ARIEL BALAOING

Art Unit

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2003.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-86 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 59-78 and 81-86 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58, 79 and 80 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 October 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 07/03/2008.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed 07/03/2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. See attached 1449 form for more details.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election of Group 1 (claims 1-58, 79, and 80) in the reply filed on 12/23/2008 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

5. Claim 52-54 recites the limitation "the header" in claim. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

For the rejections below refer to the rejection of claim 48, as this claim includes a specific header limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 1-3, 13, 21-26, 35-47, 79, and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over PANCHAL et al (US 6,519,239) in view of JANG et al (US 2005/0025082 A1).

Regarding claim 1, PANCHAL discloses a method of carrying out a broadcast/multicast service provided via a channel of a mobile communication system **100** (abstract; dispatch group service is considered a broadcast/multicast service), the method comprising steps of: receiving a identifier [**dispatch identifier**] indicative of the broadcast/multicast service (Figure 2, 3; abstract; col. 2, line 8-18; identifier received at mobile station); and generating, based on the received flow identifier, a long code mask for the channel providing the broadcast/multicast service (Figure 2, 3; abstract; col. 2, line 8-18; generations of a long code mask using identifier and a first long code mask). However, PANCHAL does not expressly disclose wherein the identifier is a flow identifier, and wherein the long code mask is a public long code mask. In a similar field of endeavor, JANG teaches wherein an identifier is a flow identifier used to identify a broadcast/multicast service, and wherein a long code mask is a public long code mask used to provide a broadcast/multicast service (paragraph 71, and 72). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify PANCHAL to include the teachings of JANG, since the use of flow identifiers and public long code masks is well known and standardized in the CDMA art (specifically in CDMA2000/WCDMA) and provides identification of a broadcast/multicast group and further provides channel assignment in a shared channel environment.

Regarding claim 2, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL and JANG further discloses wherein the channel for the broadcast/multicast service is a shared channel (PANCHAL – figure 1; col. 5, line 23-34; only one communication unit is broadcast suggest a shared channel; JANG – paragraph 72; paragraph 11, 80; shared supplemental channel).

Regarding claim 3, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL and JANG further discloses wherein the shared channel is one of a forward broadcasting fundamental channel and a forward broadcasting supplemental channel (JANG – paragraph 72; paragraph 11, 80; shared F-SCH).

Regarding claim 13, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL and JANG further discloses wherein the public long code mask is shared by all mobile terminals provided with the broadcast/multicast service (JANG – paragraph 72).

Regarding claim 21, PANCHAL discloses a method of providing a broadcast/multicast service provided in a mobile communication system (abstract), the method comprising steps of: assigning a forward channel to a broadcast/multicast service (Figure 2, 3; abstract; col. 2, line 8-18; long code mask used for channel assignment); generating a identifier of the broadcast/multicast service (Figure 2, 3; abstract; col. 2, line 8-18; dispatch service includes identifier transmitted to mobile station); and generating, based on the generated identifier, a long code mask for the

assigned forward channel (Figure 2, 3; abstract; col. 2, line 8-18; generations of a long code mask using identifier and a first long code mask). However, PANCHAL does not expressly disclose wherein the identifier is a flow identifier, and wherein the long code mask is a public long code mask. In a similar field of endeavor, JANG teaches wherein an identifier is a flow identifier used to identify a broadcast/multicast service, and wherein a long code mask is a public long code mask used to provide a broadcast/multicast service (paragraph 71, and 72). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify PANCHAL to include the teachings of JANG, since the use of flow identifiers and public long code masks is well known and standardized in the CDMA art (specifically in CDMA2000/WCDMA) and provides identification of a broadcast/multicast group and further provides channel assignment in a shared channel environment.

Regarding claim 22, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL and JANG further discloses further comprising a step of providing the generated flow identifier to each of a plurality of mobile terminals (JANG – paragraph 71, 72).

Regarding claim 23, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL and JANG further discloses wherein said flow identifier providing step is carried out prior to said forward channel assigning step (JANG – paragraph 72; F-SCH).

Regarding claim 24, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL and JANG further

discloses wherein the generated public long code mask is shared by a plurality of mobile terminals among a service group to be provided with the broadcast/multicast service (JANG – paragraph 71, 72).

Regarding claim 25, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL and JANG further discloses wherein the forward channel is shared by a plurality of mobile terminals among a service group to be provided with the broadcast/multicast service (JANG – paragraph 71, 72).

Regarding claim 26, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL and JANG further discloses wherein the shared forward channel is one of a forward broadcasting fundamental channel and a forward broadcasting supplemental channel (JANG – paragraph 72; supplemental channel).

Regarding claim 35, PANCHAL discloses a method of carrying out a broadcast/multicast service provided via a channel of a mobile communication system (abstract), the method comprising steps of: generating, based on a identifier indicative of a broadcast/multicast service, a long code mask for the channel providing the broadcast/multicast service (Figure 2, 3; abstract; col. 2, line 8-18; generations of a long code mask using identifier and a first long code mask); multiplexing the generated long code mask with a transmission signal (abstract; Figure 3; encoding of long code mask into signal); and transmitting the multiplexed signal (Figure 2, 3; abstract; col. 2, line 8-18; encode onto transmitted voice information). However, PANCHAL does not

expressly disclose wherein the identifier is a flow identifier, and wherein the long code mask is a public long code mask. In a similar field of endeavor, JANG teaches wherein an identifier is a flow identifier used to identify a broadcast/multicast service, and wherein a long code mask is a public long code mask used to provide a broadcast/multicast service (paragraph 71, and 72). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify PANCHAL to include the teachings of JANG, since the use of flow identifiers and public long code masks is well known and standardized in the CDMA art (specifically in CDMA2000/WCDMA) and provides identification of a broadcast/multicast group and further provides channel assignment in a shared channel environment.

Regarding claim 36, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL and JANG further discloses wherein the flow identifier is assigned to the broadcast/multicast service prior to providing the broadcast/multicast service (PANCHAL - col. 2, line 8-18; identifier used to identify a dispatch service and therefore would be assigned before providing the service; JANG – paragraph 71, 72; flow identifier is used for providing channel allocation and therefore would be assigned before a service can begin).

Regarding claim 37, PANCHAL discloses a method of carrying out a broadcast/multicast service provided via a channel of a mobile communication system (abstract), the method comprising steps of: generating, based on a identifier indicative of a broadcast/multicast service, a public long code mask for the channel providing the broadcast/multicast service (Figure 2, 3; abstract; col. 2, line 8-18; generations of a long

code mask using identifier and a first long code mask); multiplexing the generated long code mask with a received signal (Figure 2, 3; abstract; col. 2, line 8-18; encode onto transmitted voice information); and decoding the multiplexed signal (col. 5, line 13-22; decoding of an encoded signals occurs at a receiving unit). However, PANCHAL does not expressly disclose wherein the identifier is a flow identifier, and wherein the long code mask is a public long code mask. In a similar field of endeavor, JANG teaches wherein an identifier is a flow identifier used to identify a broadcast/multicast service, and wherein a long code mask is a public long code mask used to provide a broadcast/multicast service (paragraph 71, and 72). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify PANCHAL to include the teachings of JANG, since the use of flow identifiers and public long code masks is well known and standardized in the CDMA art (specifically in CDMA2000/WCDMA) and provides identification of a broadcast/multicast group and further provides channel assignment in a shared channel environment.

Regarding claim 38, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL and JANG further discloses wherein the flow identifier is assigned to the broadcast/multicast service prior to providing the broadcast/multicast service (PANCHAL - col. 2, line 8-18; identifier used to identify a dispatch service and therefore would be assigned before providing the service; JANG – paragraph 71, 72; flow identifier is used for providing channel allocation and therefore would be assigned before a service can begin).

Regarding claim 39, PANCHAL discloses a method of simultaneously receiving a plurality of broadcast/multicast services via a forward channel of a mobile communication system (abstract), the method comprising steps of: receiving a plurality of identifiers respectively indicative of the plurality of broadcast/multicast services (col. 3, line 40-67; PANCHAL discloses the use of multiple dispatch groups and selection of group specific identifier); selecting one of the received flow identifiers; and generating, based on the selected flow identifier, a public long code mask for the forward channel (Figure 1; abstract; col. 2, line 8-18; col. 3, line 40-67; col. 4, line 14-29; multiple channels established by communication units require a selection of different long code masks for distinguishing between channels). However, PANCHAL does not expressly disclose wherein the identifier is a flow identifier, and wherein the long code mask is a public long code mask. In a similar field of endeavor, JANG teaches wherein an identifier is a flow identifier used to identify a broadcast/multicast service, and wherein a long code mask is a public long code mask used to provide a broadcast/multicast service (paragraph 71, and 72). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify PANCHAL to include the teachings of JANG, since the use of flow identifiers and public long code masks is well known and standardized in the CDMA art (specifically in CDMA2000/WCDMA) and provides identification of a broadcast/multicast group and further provides channel assignment in a shared channel environment.

Regarding claim 40, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL and JANG further

discloses wherein the forward channel is a forward broadcast supplemental channel (paragraph 11, 72, 80; shared supplemental channel).

Regarding claim 41, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL and JANG further discloses wherein the selected flow identifier is a first broadcast/multicast service flow identifier allocated to the forward channel (paragraph 11, 72, 80; identifiers used for channel allocation across a forward and reverse channel).

Regarding 42, PANCHAL discloses a method of receiving a broadcast/multicast service simultaneously via a plurality of forward broadcast supplemental channels of a mobile communication system (abstract), the method comprising steps of: receiving a identifier indicative [**dispatch ID**] of the broadcast/multicast service (Figure 2, 3; abstract; col. 2, line 8-18; identifier received at mobile station); and generating a long code mask, using the received flow identifier and a predetermined portion of a channel identifier [**first long code mask**] for identifying the corresponding forward broadcast supplemental channel Figure 2, 3; abstract; col. 2, line 8-18; generations of a long code mask using identifier and a first long code mask). However, PANCHAL does not expressly disclose wherein the identifier is a flow identifier, and wherein the long code mask is a public long code mask. In a similar field of endeavor, JANG teaches wherein an identifier is a flow identifier used to identify a broadcast/multicast service, and wherein a long code mask is a public long code mask used to provide a broadcast/multicast service (paragraph 71, and 72). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

modify PANCHAL to include the teachings of JANG, since the use of flow identifiers and public long code masks is well known and standardized in the CDMA art (specifically in CDMA2000/WCDMA) and provides identification of a broadcast/multicast group and further provides channel assignment in a shared channel environment.

Regarding claim 43, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL and JANG further discloses wherein the generated public long code mask has a length of 42 bits (JANG - PLCM definition Table on page 2).

Regarding claim 44, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL and JANG does not expressly disclose wherein the public long code mask has a length of 42 bits. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to include a length of 42 bits, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component (i.e. size of the code mask). A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Regarding claim 45, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL and JANG does not expressly disclose wherein the channel identifier includes a maximum of seven bits. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to provide a channel identifier of 7 bits or less, since such a modification would have involved a mere change

in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Regarding claim 46, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL and JANG does not expressly disclose wherein the predetermined portion is the four least significant bits of the channel identifier. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the channel identifier at the four least significant bits, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

Regarding claim 47, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL and JANG does not expressly disclose wherein the predetermined portion is the three least significant bits of the channel identifier. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to the three least significant bits, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

Regarding claim 79, PANCHAL discloses a mobile terminal comprising: a first module for receiving and storing a identifier for a broadcast/multicast service (Figure 2, 3; abstract; col. 2, line 8-18; identifier received at mobile station); and a second module for generating a long code mask to be used in a channel for the broadcast/multicast service upon providing the broadcast/multicast service using the flow identifier for the broadcast/multicast service (Figure 2, 3; abstract; col. 2, line 8-18; generations of a long

code mask using identifier and a first long code mask). However, PANCHAL does not expressly disclose wherein the identifier is a flow identifier, and wherein the long code mask is a public long code mask. In a similar field of endeavor, JANG teaches wherein an identifier is a flow identifier used to identify a broadcast/multicast service, and wherein a long code mask is a public long code mask used to provide a broadcast/multicast service (paragraph 71, and 72). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify PANCHAL to include the teachings of JANG, since the use of flow identifiers and public long code masks is well known and standardized in the CDMA art (specifically in CDMA2000/WCDMA) and provides identification of a broadcast/multicast group and further provides channel assignment in a shared channel environment.

Regarding claim 80, PANCHAL discloses a base station comprising: a first module for assigning one forward channel to one broadcast/multicast service, the first module generating a identifier of the broadcast/multicast service (Figure 2, 3; abstract; col. 2, line 8-18; identifier received at mobile station); and a second module for generating a long code mask for the assigned forward channel using the generated flow identifier upon providing the broadcast/multicast service (Figure 2, 3; abstract; col. 2, line 8-18; generations of a long code mask using identifier and a first long code mask). However, PANCHAL does not expressly disclose wherein the identifier is a flow identifier, and wherein the long code mask is a public long code mask. In a similar field of endeavor, JANG teaches wherein an identifier is a flow identifier used to identify a broadcast/multicast service, and wherein a long code mask is a public long code mask

used to provide a broadcast/multicast service (paragraph 71, and 72). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify PANCHAL to include the teachings of JANG, since the use of flow identifiers and public long code masks is well known and standardized in the CDMA art (specifically in CDMA2000/WCDMA) and provides identification of a broadcast/multicast group and further provides channel assignment in a shared channel environment.

Regarding claim 1, PANCHAL discloses a method of carrying out a broadcast/multicast service provided via a channel of a mobile communication system **100** (abstract; dispatch group service is considered a broadcast/multicast service), the method comprising steps of: receiving a identifier [**dispatch identifier**] indicative of the broadcast/multicast service (Figure 2, 3; abstract; col. 2, line 8-18; identifier received at mobile station); and generating, based on the received flow identifier, a long code mask for the channel providing the broadcast/multicast service (Figure 2, 3; abstract; col. 2, line 8-18; generations of a long code mask using identifier and a first long code mask). However, PANCHAL does not expressly disclose wherein the identifier is a flow identifier, and wherein the long code mask is a public long code mask. In a similar field of endeavor, JANG teaches wherein an identifier is a flow identifier used to identify a broadcast/multicast service, and wherein a long code mask is a public long code mask used to provide a broadcast/multicast service (paragraph 71, and 72). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify PANCHAL to include the teachings of JANG, since the use of flow identifiers and public long code masks is well known and standardized in the CDMA art

(specifically in CDMA2000/WCDMA) and provides identification of a broadcast/multicast group and further provides channel assignment in a shared channel environment.

10. Claims 4-11, 14-18, 27-32, 48, 49, 52-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over PANCHAL et al (US 6,519,239) in view of JANG et al (US 2005/0025082 A1) and further in view of PADOVANI et al (US 5,535,239).

Regarding claim 4, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL and JANG does not expressly disclose wherein the generated public long code mask includes a specific header for the broadcast/multicast service. In a similar field of endeavor, PADOVANI discloses wherein a generated public long code mask includes a specific header for a service (Figure 8B, col. 14, line 7-14). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of PANCHAL and JANG to include the teachings of PADOVANI, since header information of a transmitted or received data frame provides various information concerning the payload (i.e. data) contained in the transmission.

Regarding claim 5, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI further discloses wherein the specific header has a value that does not coincide with previous public long code masks and does not coincide with previous long code masks (PANCHAL – col. 3, line 25-40; PADOVANI – Figure 8B; PANCHAL shows

group identification that does not coincide with previous code masks, while PADOVANI shows the use of a header within a public long code mask).

Regarding claim 6, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Although the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI disclose the use of a 10 bit header (see Figure 8B), the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the value of the specific header is set to one of "1100010000" and "1100010001." It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use any header number to indicate characteristics of a the public long code mask since the applicant has not disclosed that a specific header used to indicate a characteristic of the public long code mask solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with a header of any chosen value.

Regarding claim 7, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Although the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI disclose the use of a 10 bit header (see Figure 8B), the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the value of the specific header is "1100010000" when the channel is a forward broadcasting fundamental channel. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use any header number to indicate characteristics of a the public long code mask since the applicant has not disclosed that a specific header used to indicate a characteristic of the public long code mask solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it

appears that the invention would perform equally well with a header of any chosen value.

Regarding claim 8, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Although the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI disclose the use of a 10 bit header (see Figure 8B), the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the value of the specific header is "1100010001" when the channel is a forward broadcasting supplementary channel. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use any header number to indicate characteristics of a the public long code mask since the applicant has not disclosed that a specific header used to indicate a characteristic of the public long code mask solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with a header of any chosen value.

Regarding claim 9, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI further discloses wherein the generated public long code mask has a length of 42 bits (JANG - PLCM definition Table on page 2; PADOVANI – Figure 8B).

Regarding claim 10, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL and JANG further discloses wherein the specific header has a length of ten bits (PADOVANI – Figure 8B).

Regarding claim 11, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and

PADOVANI further discloses wherein the flow identifier has a length selected from the group consisting of 16 bits, 24 bits, and 32 bits (PADOVANI – Figure 8B; 32-bit identifier).

Regarding claim 14, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL and JANG further discloses wherein the generated public long code mask has a length of 42 bits (JANG - PLCM definition Table on page 2), said generating step comprising a step of: specific information having a value that does not coincide with previous public long code masks and does not coincide with previous long code masks (PANCHAL – col. 3, line 25-40; PANCHAL shows group identification that does not coincide with previous code masks); wherein the flow identifier occupies a predetermined length of unallocated bits of the generated public long code mask (JANG - paragraph 72-73; flow identifier of public long code mask would inherently require a predetermined length of unallocated bits). However, the combination of PANCHAL and JANG does not expressly disclose allocating ten upper bits to a specific header. In the same field of endeavor, PADOVANI discloses allocating ten upper bits to a specific header (Figure 8B, col. 14, line 7-14); and wherein a identifier occupies a predetermined length of unallocated bits of a generated public long code mask (Figure 8B, col. 14, line 7-14). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of PANCHAL and JANG to include the teachings of PADOVANI, since header information of a transmitted or received data frame provides various information concerning the payload (i.e. data) contained in the transmission.

Regarding claim 15, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Although the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI disclose the use of a 10 bit header (see Figure 8B), the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the value of the specific header is set to one of "1100010000" and "1100010001." It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use any header number to indicate characteristics of a the public long code mask since the applicant has not disclosed that a specific header used to indicate a characteristic of the public long code mask solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with a header of any chosen value.

Regarding claim 16, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Although the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI disclose the use of a 10 bit header (see Figure 8B), the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the value of the specific header is "1100010000" when the channel is a forward broadcasting fundamental channel. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use any header number to indicate characteristics of a the public long code mask since the applicant has not disclosed that a specific header used to indicate a characteristic of the public long code mask solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with a header of any chosen value.

Regarding claim 17, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Although the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI disclose the use of a 10 bit header (see Figure 8B), the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the value of the specific header is "1100010001" when the channel is a forward broadcasting supplementary channel. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use any header number to indicate characteristics of a the public long code mask since the applicant has not disclosed that a specific header used to indicate a characteristic of the public long code mask solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with a header of any chosen value.

Regarding claim 18, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI further discloses wherein the flow identifier has a length selected from the group consisting of 16 bits, 24 bits, and 32 bits (PADOVANI – Figure 8B; 32-bit identifier).

Regarding claim 27, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL and JANG further discloses wherein the generated public long code mask has a length of 42 bits (JANG - PLCM definition Table on page 2), said generating step comprising a step of: specific information having a value that does not coincide with previous public long code masks and does not coincide with previous long code masks (PANCHAL – col. 3, line 25-40;

PANCHAL shows group identification that does not coincide with previous code masks); wherein the flow identifier occupies a predetermined length of unallocated bits of the generated public long code mask (JANG - paragraph 72-73; flow identifier of public long code mask would inherently require a predetermined length of unallocated bits). However, the combination of PANCHAL and JANG does not expressly disclose allocating ten upper bits to a specific header. In the same field of endeavor, PADOVANI discloses allocating ten upper bits to a specific header (Figure 8B, col. 14, line 7-14); and wherein a identifier occupies a predetermined length of unallocated bits of a generated public long code mask (Figure 8B, col. 14, line 7-14). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of PANCHAL and JANG to include the teachings of PADOVANI, since header information of a transmitted or received data frame provides various information concerning the payload (i.e. data) contained in the transmission.

Regarding claim 28, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Although the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI disclose the use of a 10 bit header (see Figure 8B), the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the value of the specific header is set to one of "1100010000" and "1100010001." It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use any header number to indicate characteristics of a the public long code mask since the applicant has not disclosed that a specific header used to indicate a characteristic of the public long code mask solves

any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with a header of any chosen value.

Regarding claim 29, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Although the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI disclose the use of a 10 bit header (see Figure 8B), the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the value of the specific header is "1100010000" when the channel is a forward broadcasting fundamental channel. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use any header number to indicate characteristics of a the public long code mask since the applicant has not disclosed that a specific header used to indicate a characteristic of the public long code mask solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with a header of any chosen value.

Regarding claim 30, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. Although the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI disclose the use of a 10 bit header (see Figure 8B), the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the value of the specific header is "1100010001" when the channel is a forward broadcasting supplementary channel. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use any header number to indicate characteristics of a the public long code mask since the applicant has not disclosed that a specific header used to indicate a characteristic of the public long code mask solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it

appears that the invention would perform equally well with a header of any chosen value.

Regarding claim 31, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI further discloses wherein the flow identifier has a length selected from the group consisting of 16 bits, 24 bits, and 32 bits (PADOVANI – Figure 8B; 32-bit identifier).

Regarding claim 32, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI further discloses wherein the flow identifier for the broadcast/multicast service occupies a BCMC_FLOW_ID field (JANG –paragraph 44, 45).

Regarding claim 48, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL and JANG do not expressly disclose wherein the public long code mask comprises a specific header occupying a most significant bit portion of the public long code mask. In a similar field of endeavor, PADOVANI discloses wherein a public long code mask comprises a specific header occupying a most significant bit portion of the public long code mask (Figure 8B, col. 14, line 7-14); and wherein a identifier occupies a predetermined length of unallocated bits of a generated public long code mask (Figure 8B, col. 14, line 7-14). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of PANCHAL and JANG to include the teachings of PADOVANI, since header information

of a transmitted or received data frame provides various information concerning the payload (i.e. data) contained in the transmission.

Regarding claim 49, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the channel identifier and the service flow identifier are arranged from a least significant bit to a more significant bit, respectively. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide identifiers in any order, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70.

Regarding claim 52, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL and JANG does not expressly disclose wherein the public long code mask comprises a specific header occupying a most significant bit portion of the public long code mask. In a similar field of endeavor, PADOVANI discloses wherein a public long code mask comprises a specific header occupying a most significant bit portion of the public long code mask (Figure 8B, col. 14, line 7-14); and wherein an identifier occupies a predetermined length of unallocated bits of a generated public long code mask (Figure 8B, col. 14, line 7-14). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of PANCHAL and JANG to include the teachings of PADOVANI, since header information of a transmitted or received data frame provides various information concerning the

payload (i.e. data) contained in the transmission. However, the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not disclose wherein the header has a length of 7 bits. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to change the size of the header to 7 bits, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). Furthermore, the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the bits correspond to one of 1100001, 1100010, and 1100011. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use any header number to indicate characteristics of a the public long code mask since the applicant has not disclosed that a specific header used to indicate a characteristic of the public long code mask solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with a header of any chosen value.

Regarding claim 53, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL and JANG does not expressly disclose wherein the public long code mask comprises a specific header occupying a most significant bit portion of the public long code mask. In a similar field of endeavor, PADOVANI discloses wherein a public long code mask comprises a specific header occupying a most significant bit portion of the public long code mask (Figure 8B, col. 14, line 7-14); and wherein a identifier occupies a predetermined length of unallocated bits of a generated public long code mask (Figure 8B, col. 14, line 7-14). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of PANCHAL and JANG to include the teachings of PADOVANI, since header information of a transmitted or received data frame provides various information concerning the payload (i.e. data) contained in the transmission. However, the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not disclose wherein the header has a length of six bits. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to change the size of the header to six bits, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). Furthermore, the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the bits correspond to one of 110001 and 00xxxx. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use any header number to indicate characteristics of a the public long code mask since the applicant has not disclosed that a specific header used to indicate a characteristic of the public long code mask solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with a header of any chosen value.

Regarding claim 54, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI (see claim 48 regarding specific header rejection) does not expressly disclose wherein the channel identifier comprises seven bits. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to provide a channel identifier of seven bits, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component (i.e. size

of a channel identifier). A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Furthermore, the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the header is selecte from the group consisting of 110, 000, and 001. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to use any header number to indicate characteristics of a the public long code mask since the applicant has not disclosed that a specific header used to indicate a characteristic of the public long code mask solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with a header of any chosen value.

11. Claim 12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over PANCHAL et al (US 6,519,239) in view of JANG et al (US 2005/0025082 A1) and further in view of HUANG et al (US 5,721,957).

Regarding claim 12, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL and JANG does not expressly disclose wherein, if the length of the flow identifier is not 32 bits, the public long code mask is padded to fill remaining bits. HUANG discloses if the length of information is not a predetermined length, a word is padded to fill remaining bits (see Figure 13; col. 9, line 45-65; padding of right most bits with zero when data is not used). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of PANCHAL and JANG to include the teachings of HUANG, since the use of padding bits (i.e. 0 or 1) of a data

word is a conventional practice in the art and allows transmission of data using predetermined length data using less than a fixed data word.

12. Claims 19, 20, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over PANCHAL et al (US 6,519,239) in view of JANG et al (US 2005/0025082 A1) and PADOVANI et al (US 5,535,239) and further in view of HUANG et al (US 5,721,957).

Regarding claim 19, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein, if the length of the flow identifier is not 32 bits, the public long code mask is padded to fill a remainder of the 42 bits, the remainder excluding the specific header allocation and the predetermined length occupied by the flow identifier. HUANG discloses if the length of information is not a predetermined length, a word is padded to fill remaining bits (see Figure 13; col. 9, line 45-65; padding of right most bits with zero when data is not used). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of PANCHAL and JANG to include the teachings of HUANG, since the use of padding bits (i.e. 0 or 1) of a data word is a conventional practice in the art and allows transmission of data using predetermined length data using less than a fixed data word.

Regarding claim 20, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL, JANG,

PADOVANI, and HUANG further discloses wherein the padded bits are all lower-order bits (see Figure 13; col. 9, line 45-65; least significant bits).

Regarding claim 33, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein, if the length of the flow identifier is not 32 bits, the public long code mask is padded to fill a remainder of the 42 bits, the remainder excluding the specific header allocation and the predetermined length occupied by the flow identifier. HUANG discloses if the length of information is not a predetermined length, a word is padded to fill remaining bits (see Figure 13; col. 9, line 45-65; padding of right most bits with zero when data is not used). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of PANCHAL and JANG to include the teachings of HUANG, since the use of padding bits (i.e. 0 or 1) of a data word is a conventional practice in the art and allows transmission of data using predetermined length data using less than a filed data word.

Regarding claim 34, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. The combination of PANCHAL, JANG, PADOVANI, and HUANG further discloses wherein the padded bits are all lower-order bits (see Figure 13; col. 9, line 45-65; least significant bits).

13. Claims 50 and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over PANCHAL et al (US 6,519,239) in view of JANG et al (US 2005/0025082 A1) and

PADOVANI et al (US 5,535,239) and further in view of BORDER (US 2002/0016851 A1).

Regarding claim 50, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein a length of the header is variable according to a length of the channel identifier. BORDER discloses wherein a length of a header is variable according to a length of an identifier (abstract; paragraph 141, 144; header is sizable based on payload size).

Regarding claim 51, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, PADOVANI, and BORDER does not expressly disclose wherein, if the predetermined portion of the channel identifier is less than n bits, where $n < 7$, the header has a length of $10-n$ bits. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a header based on a variable, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

14. Claims 55-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over PANCHAL et al (US 6,519,239) in view of JANG et al (US 2005/0025082 A1) and further in view of PADOVANI et al (US 5,535,239) and further in view of HEBB (US 5,757,796).

Regarding claim 55, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL, JANG,

and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the flow identifier has a length less than 32 bits. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to provide an identifier less than 32 bits in size, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). Furthermore, the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the flow identifier is padded from a most significant bit adjacent the header. HEBB discloses wherein, if an identifier is less than a length, the identifier is padded from a most significant bit (col. 4, line 49-57; zero padding of most significant bit if space exists). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI to include the teachings of HEBB, since the use of padding bits (i.e. 0 or 1) of a data word is a conventional practice in the art and allows transmission of data using predetermined length data using less than a fixed data word.

Regarding claim 56, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the flow identifier and the header have lengths of 16 bits and 7 bits. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to provide a header of 16 bits and an identifier of 7 bits in size, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). Furthermore, the combination of PANCHAL,

JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the flow identifier is padded from a most significant bit adjacent the header. HEBB discloses wherein, if n identifier is less than a length, the identifier is padded from a most significant bit (col. 4, line 49-57; zero padding of most significant bit if space exists). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI to include the teachings of HEBB, since the use of padding bits (i.e. 0 or 1) of a data word is a conventional practice in the art and allows transmission of data using predetermined length data using less than a full data word.

Regarding claim 57, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the flow identifier and the header have lengths of 24 bits and 7 bits. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to provide a header of 24 bits and an identifier of 7 bits in size, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). Furthermore, the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the flow identifier is padded from a most significant bit adjacent the header. HEBB discloses wherein, if n identifier is less than a length, the identifier is padded from a most significant bit (col. 4, line 49-57; zero padding of most significant bit if space exists). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made

to modify the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI to include the teachings of HEBB, since the use of padding bits (i.e. 0 or 1) of a data word is a conventional practice in the art and allows transmission of data using predetermined length data using less than a full data word.

Regarding claim 58, see the rejections of the parent claim concerning the subject matter this claim is dependent upon. However, the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the flow identifier and the header have lengths of 33 bits and 3 bits. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to provide a header of 33 bits and an identifier of 3 bits in size, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in the size of a component. A change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955). Furthermore, the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI does not expressly disclose wherein the flow identifier is padded from a most significant bit adjacent the header. HEBB discloses wherein, if an identifier is less than a length, the identifier is padded from a most significant bit (col. 4, line 49-57; zero padding of most significant bit if space exists). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of PANCHAL, JANG, and PADOVANI to include the teachings of HEBB, since the use of padding bits (i.e. 0 or 1) of a data word is a conventional practice in the art and allows transmission of data using predetermined length data using less than a full data word.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ARIEL BALAOING whose telephone number is (571)272-7317. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, V. Paul Harper can be reached on (571) 272-7605. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ariel Balaoing/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617

/A. B./
Examiner, Art Unit 2617